

27 March 2015

From: Facilities Services Branch Manager, Bangor Facilities Engineering and Acquisitions Department, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: George Karl, Engineering Technician, GS-0802-11, Bangor Facilities and Engineering Acquisitions Department, PRB 23, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Subj: COUNSELING MEMORANDUM

1. The purpose of this letter is to inform you that aspects of your work-place conduct are unacceptable.

a). Specification: Misuse of Official Time

From 8 January 2015, through 6 February 2015, you sent at least six (6) e-mails to management officials asking for information unrelated to your official work assignments.

(1). On 8 and 9 January 2015, during your work day you emailed Mr. (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) asking him for his supervisor policies when he supervised you several years ago. Over the past four (4) weeks you sent two (2) follow up emails to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) directing him to respond to this information request.

(2). In January 2015, you e-mailed (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) and (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) during your work day, asking for the LEAD Engineer Technician interview questions that were used for a competitive recruitment vacancy to which you applied.

(3). On 06 February 2015, you e-mailed (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) during your work day, seeking information he might have regarding a personal incident between you and NBK Security that occurred on or about 1 August 2014.

You are hereby cautioned that the use of official time to pursue your own inquiries and question other government employees on matters not related to your official duties constitutes misuse of official government time, and may be subject to disciplinary action if continued.

b). Specification: Disrespectful Conduct

In your communication to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) and (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) you used disrespectful tone and language.

(1). In your 08 January e-mail to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) Supervisor Facility Operations Specialist, you asked for information not related to a work assignment. On 09 January you sent a second email to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) stating, "Second request. Please respond by close of business today." On 06 February you sent another email to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Subj: COUNSELING MEMORANDUM

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) that stated, "Third request. It has been almost a month and you continue refuse to address or respond to my emails. Why? Please explain."

(2). On 28 January (b)(6)(b)(7)(c), Director of Facilities Engineering Acquisitions Department, Bremerton, emailed you that he would not release interview questions for a position you recently competed for. You responded to this email with a challenging and disrespectful tone. Specifically, you stated, "Should I do a FOIA or have my attorney do discovery on them instead?"

You are hereby cautioned that your demanding, and challenging tone of communication towards management officials, is disrespectful and may be subject to disciplinary action if continued.

C). Specification: Workplace disruption

On two (2) occasions you verbally bullied NAVFAC NW personnel, while they were in the execution of their duties, by stating you were going to sue them.

(1) On 15 October 2014, you communicated to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) FOIA Officer, that unless you and (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) came to an agreement on your FOIA request, you would sue him.

(2) On 12 December 2014, you asked (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) when he was retiring; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) responded and said "7-8 Years." Later, that same day (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) approached you and asked you "Why did you want to know when I was retiring." You replied, in words to the effect that you were suing (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) and it would be best if he retired sooner rather than later, and that he was not the only person named in your lawsuit.

You are hereby cautioned that your antagonizing, bullying, and intimidating remarks to NAVFAC NW Personnel, in the workplace, are disruptive to the workplace and Command and must stop immediately. If this behavior continues you may be subject to disciplinary action.

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Copy to:
HRO

Acknowledgement of receipt:

Employee Request to sign
George Karl

4/3/15
Date

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 15:21
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: FW: Request for Meeting
Signed By: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) @navy.mil

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Call me when you have a chance. I need to discuss a few things before moving forward.

Thanks,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131

Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 1:29 PM

To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y

Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB1; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB221

Subject: RE: Request for Meeting

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

As you NOW claim this is of "a counseling nature", I will take that to mean it is an attempt to build false disciplinary action (adverse action) of some sort against me. Your initial refusal to state the reason for the meeting and the pretextual nature of how you went about trying to trick me into thinking this was "non-disciplinary" when it really is a counseling session, shows me you continue to openly lie about your intentions and motivations.

This "administrative process" is clearly meant to intimidate me and continue the retaliation for my EEO participation for reporting to the Chief Union Steward (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) how YOU continue to allow (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) to harass, cause disparate treatment and encourage the hostile work environment here. This continual harassment is also taking time away from me working on my projects which puts me at risk for not completing them on time (and I'm sure you will try to use that against me too).

The timing on this sudden meeting easily coincides with the Monday March 30th, 2015 email from the Chief Union Steward about my report to her of (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) continual harassment and violation of his cease and desist order YOU signed. It is clearly retaliation or "pay back" for my participating in the protected EEO activity.

Since you now admit this is a counseling session and part of an administrative process. I believe this is a continuation of your (and command's) attempt to force me into such scenarios that will result in made up disciplinary actions and it will not be tolerated.

I formally request the Chief Union Steward, (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) be present for this disciplinary counseling session. Per the Union Agreement, it is your responsibility to arrange this. I will consider ANY further questions or communications without Union representation a violation of my Weingarten Rights and file another grievance against you.

I will file another EEO complaint for this obvious retaliation against my participation in the EEO process for (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) and now myself who had my own unsuccessful EEO ADR on Wednesday March 28th.

Let me know when you have arranged for my Union representative to be present and we can reschedule this DISCIPLINARY administrative process counseling session.

R/

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap
☎: Office 360-396-4710
☎: Cell 360-536-7139
Fax 360-396-4090
email: george.karl@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 12:24 PM
To: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Subject: RE: Request for Meeting

George,

I'm directing you to meet with me at 1300 today. This meeting is of a counseling nature. This is an administrative process, and you are not entitled to have an attorney present for the counseling session.

V/r,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 11:23 AM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Subject: RE: Request for Meeting

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

My attorney requests a FULL explanation/detail of this meeting ... your reason to call it, discussion topics, people present, etc.

I do not trust you as you have lied. You have called me into your office before on the pretext of discussing my contractors access to a job location, then under that false pretense gave me a "non-disciplinary" Letter of Caution. Your false reasons that hide your true intentions or motivations won't catch me again with your lies.

Since I am working on a libel law suit against you for making false/misleading statements on that same Letter of Caution, it would be inappropriate for me to attend any meeting without at least my Union representative or attorney there to observe the interactions and what is discussed. I do not trust your pretextual "non-disciplinary" claim and do fear this is disciplinary, or at least another false step along the way to being disciplinary.

Any attempt to claim insubordination or attempt yet another Letter of Caution will be met with more charges against you for retaliation for my participation in an EEO investigation (a protected activity) and likely another civil suit action

against you personally. I have active EEO complaints against you (and others) that are moving into the formal stage now along with personal law suits against you (and others) in the works.

I temporarily decline your meeting "request" until I further discuss your request with my attorney and you provide us with the details. Then you can arrange a Union representative familiar with the retaliation history from all of NAVFAC NW (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) or I can arrange to have my attorney attend ANY such secretive meetings in the future.

R/

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap
☎: Office 360-396-4710
☎: Cell 360-536-7139
Fax 360-396-4090
email: george.karl@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 6:43 AM
To: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Subject: Request for Meeting

George,

I'm requesting a meeting with you at 1300 today 4/1/15 in my office. The meeting is non-disciplinary in nature.

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)
FMFS Branch Head
(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, BD4
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 8:32
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: FW: GEORGE KARL
Signed By: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD4
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2014 1:25 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, O9C
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD4
Subject: GEORGE KARL

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

I just had an interesting conversation with George Karl about 10 minutes ago.

He came to my office wanting to speak. I invited him to sit down so we could discuss his request. He refused, electing to go to the cafeteria in a public area. I grabbed his request file and proceeded to follow him to the lunchroom and took a seat.

When seated, he gave me a document he purportedly prepared, consisting of approximately 6 pages, of allegations that I am acting improperly in my capacity as FOIA Officer. I took a moment to skim through it and asked him what he wanted me to do. His reply was that unless we came to an agreement regarding his requests, he was going to sue.

I replied that a suit against the Navy was always an option--then he cut me off and said he was going to sue me personally. At that point, he took the document and walked off. I followed him down the hallway and encouraged him to return--and he did.

When he got back to the tables, he again reiterated that he would sue me personally if I didn't settle the requests with him. At that point, I told him I believed the Navy would simply place themselves in the middle of the lawsuit--and again, he cut me off, said I was wrong because I had no immunity, and stormed off.

I'm not looking for any particular action--I just wanted to relate this matter to you before I forgot some of the details of the incident in the event of a lawsuit against me in my capacity as FOIA Officer.

v/r

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2015 11:31
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: FW: George Karl Questioning about Retirement
Signed By: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 5:59 AM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Subject: RE: George Karl Questioning about Retirement

On Friday around 1100 George Karl came into my office and asked when I was retiring and I told him 7-8 years and then he left. I felt that was a strange question and I was looking for (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) and ran into George when he was leaving the trailer T075. I asked him why he wanted to know when I was retiring. He said that he was suing me and it would be best if I retired and I am not the only person on the lawsuit. (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) was walking out of T075 and that is when I told him what happened.

Now I believe that this is threatening and intimidation. I have lost sleep over this and it is always on the back of my mind.

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)
FMFS PRK-232
Lead Engineering Tech
(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil
WK: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)
CELL: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2014 1:46 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Subject: RE: George Karl Questioning about Retirement

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

After (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) shared his discussion with George with me, I was sitting at desk and George dropped in and asked if I was eligible to retire and I answered no and he left.

As I understand it, and (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) can validate. He did the same to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) only (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) went to his cube and questioned what he meant by it, and that is when George told him he planned to sue him. (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) will have to provide his exact statement.

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO

Sent: Friday, December 12, 2014 1:36 PM

To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23

Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2

Subject: George Karl Questioning about Retirement

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Please send me a short statement about your encounter with Mr. Karl this afternoon. Monday is fine if you can't get to it today.

Thanks,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) P.E.

Deputy Public Works Officer

Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap

Comm: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Cell: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Email: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2015 11:30
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: FW: Meeting
Signed By: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Here is an example of an off handed threat from George..

v/r

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2014 11:16 AM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: RE: Meeting

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

He refused on the advice of his attorney, and then made a statement to the affect "do not get in to too deep" to which I replied I'm in your supervisory chain, I'm doing my job.

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2014 8:55 AM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Subject: Meeting

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Tell George that he must meet me at 1000. We reviewed his request for legal representation and this is a non-disciplinary action and legal representation and video-taping the conversation is not appropriate. If you would like to have a union representative present you may do so. This is a direct order and we will go to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) office at 1000 and if you wish will make sure a union representative is present with you.

Thanks,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) P.E.
Deputy Public Works Officer
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap

Comm: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Cell: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Email: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2015 11:33
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: FW: George Karl Questioning about Retirement
Signed By: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

George asked same question from (b)(6)(b)(7)(c). See below.

v/r

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2014 1:46 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Subject: RE: George Karl Questioning about Retirement

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

After (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) shared his discussion with George with me, I was sitting at desk and George dropped in and asked if I was eligible to retire and I answered no and he left.

As I understand it, and (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) can validate. He did the same to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) only (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) went to his cube and questioned what he meant by it, and that is when George told him he planned to sue him. (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) will have to provide his exact statement.

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2014 1:36 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Subject: George Karl Questioning about Retirement

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c); (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Please send me a short statement about your encounter with Mr. Karl this afternoon. Monday is fine if you can't get to it today.

Thanks,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) P.E.

Deputy Public Works Officer

Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap

Comm: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Cell: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Email: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2015 10:12
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23Y
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: FW: PERSONAL INQUIRIES - ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED DO NOT DISCLOSE
Signed By: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

I talked to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) and we think you are best person to deliver notice described below. (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) will be drafting something up for you.

BTW: I wouldn't doubt George will think this is some sort of retribution for him going on his upcoming DoDIG trip.

v/r

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW OGC, 09C
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2015 2:54 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: PERSONAL INQUIRIES - ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED DO NOT DISCLOSE

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(5)

If you have specific questions lets discuss further. Thanks!

V/r,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Assistant Counsel
NAVFAC Northwest
1101 Tautog Circle, Suite 303
Silverdale, WA 98315

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) (office)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) (fax)

ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION
DO NOT COPY OR FORWARD OUTSIDE DON
DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2015 2:39 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW OGC, 09C
Subject: FW: Results of you looking into Camera stop August 1 2014
Importance: High

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Forwarding per (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) request. I will not respond until I get some direction.

v/r

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 2:40 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Subject: Results of you looking into Camera stop August 1 2014
Importance: High

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

I have learned through a FOIA request that on Monday, August 04, 2014 you sent an email to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c), (b)(6)(b)(7)(c), (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) and (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) about me being "detained" for having a helmet camera. The incident was on Friday and on Monday you stated in that email that you have no official word from other source (base security etc.) and that you will "Look into it further".

1. Did you ever get any official word of this stop and if so what was that information stated or provided to you?
2. What were the results of you looking into it further?

Please respond by COB 02/13/15

R/

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2015 8:12
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Subject: RE: 1101 visitation
Signed By: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) could meet with Mr. Karl to find out why he wants the information, if (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) would like me present I can attend. However, I do not know if it is necessary that I attend. The discussion would be a result of what the employee is requesting. I would suggest that (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) send Mr. Karl an e-mail to the effect of "I would be happy to meet with you to discuss your request, let me know if you would like to meet and I can schedule a time." This way Mr. Karl can make the decision to meet with (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) or not, he has no leverage on Management if we give him the option. If you have questions call me and we can discuss.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

NAVFAC Northwest
Human Resources Specialist
(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 3:31 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Subject: FW: 1101 visitation
Importance: High

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

FYI. Any advice? I am a bit concerned that remaining silent gives him some sort of leverage somehow. Should (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) and maybe you offer to meet with him to discuss?

v/r

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 2:58 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD4
Subject: FW: 1101 visitation
Importance: High

Another request from Mr. Karl. I do not plan to respond unless I hear different from you.

Thanks, (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 2:46 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Subject: 1101 visitation
Importance: High

Third request. It's been almost a month and you continue refuse to address or respond to my emails. Why? Please explain.

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap
☎: Office 360-396-4710
☎: Cell 360-536-7139
Fax 360-396-4090
email: george.karl@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 1:31 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Subject: FW: 1101 visitation
Importance: High

Second request, please respond by close of business today.

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap
☎: Office 360-396-4710
☎: Cell 360-536-7139
Fax 360-396-4090
email: george.karl@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 2015 11:53 AM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB23
Subject: 1101 visitation

When you were our supervisor, did you allow people to visit 1101 for other than official business, such as when people go over for coffee or to get something to eat, etc.?

R/

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap

Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap

☎: Office 360-396-4710

☎: Cell 360-536-7139

Fax 360-396-4090

email: george.karl@navy.mil

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2015 16:53
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD3
Subject: FW: Lead ET interview questions
Signed By: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)@navy.mil

FYI.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2015 4:46 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, BD4
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) CIV NAVFAC NW, DPWO; (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Subject: FW: Lead ET interview questions

Good afternoon (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

I received the e-mail below from Mr. Karl today. He is requesting a list of questions that I developed for interviewing potential Lead Engineering Technician candidates here in Bremerton. As I indicate in the e-mail chain below, I would prefer to keep these questions among my managers and me. This is so that the questions won't get distributed to a lot of people and potential candidates will not have prepared answers for future interviews (essentially levelling the field for all candidates applying for the job).

Mr. Karl indicated that he may initiate a FOIA request for the questions or engage his attorney. How should I proceed?

I appreciate your help in this matter.

Very respectfully,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2015 9:59 AM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Subject: RE: Lead ET interview questions

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

I understand that aspect, however I was already interviewed so there is no hazard of any planned or canned responses, nor would I have an unfair advantage since I already went through the interview process and would know what to expect in any future interviews, etc.

Should I do a FOIA or have my attorney do discovery on them instead? Either way is fine with me if you're uncomfortable voluntarily providing the information but of course it would be simpler to provide the information.

R/

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap
☎: Office 360-396-4710
☎: Cell 360-536-7139
Fax 360-396-4090
email: george.karl@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2015 9:48 AM
To: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB21Y
Subject: RE: Lead ET interview questions

Good morning, George. I'd prefer not to send out the questions we ask for that interview. My intent is to make all candidates think on their feet and not provide a prepared, canned response. I also want to make sure no one has an unfair advantage in the interview process.

Regards,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB21Y
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 9:24 AM
To: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB2
Subject: RE: Lead ET interview questions

George,

I was not on the interview panel.

I will refer you to (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) for your inquiry.

Respectfully,

(b)(6)(b)(7)(c) P.E.

Project Management and Engineering Branch Head
Public Works Dept. Kitsap - Bremerton
B467 4th floor
COM (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) (DSN (b)(6)(b)(7)(c))
CELL (b)(6)(b)(7)(c)

Warfighting First. Operate Forward. Be Ready.

"Don't say 'I can't' on this work. The 'I can't's' are unknown in the world's work and unremembered in history" Gutzon Borglum

For Official Use Only

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 9:17 AM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB21Y
Subject: FW: Lead ET interview questions

Good morning,

I wanted to follow up on this... could I get a list of interview questions that were asked at my interview please?

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap
☎: Office 360-396-4710
☎: Cell 360-536-7139
Fax 360-396-4090
email: george.karl@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: Karl, George F III CIV NAVFAC NW, PRB2131
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2015 7:16 AM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(c) NAVFAC NW, PRB21Y
Subject: Lead ET interview questions

Sir,

Several months ago I was interviewed for an opening there as Lead ET. Could I get the list of interview questions for that interview please?

Thanks

George Karl
Engineering Technician/COR
Public Works Dept. Naval Base Kitsap
☎: Office 360-396-4710
☎: Cell 360-536-7139
Fax 360-396-4090
email: george.karl@navy.mil

